

Requirement on the ground that no adequate reasons and/or examples have been provided to support a conclusion of patentable distinctness between the claims of Group I - III.

The Examiner has characterized the relationship between Group I, on the one hand, and Groups II and III, on the other, as one of an intermediate-final product relationship. The Examiner has asserted that inventions so related are distinct if the intermediate product is useful to make another final product (MPEP §806.04(b), third paragraph) and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP §806.04(h)).


However, the inventions of Group I is not so related to the inventions of Groups II and III. In fact, none of the claims of Group I are directed to any products or intermediates. Instead, the claims of Group I are directed to various processes.

Accordingly, and for the reasons presented above, Applicants submit that the Office has failed to meet the burden necessary in order to sustain the Restriction Requirement. Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now ready for examination on the merits, and early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Stephen G. Baxter, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No.: 32,884

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)